

152569

ORIGINAL
(KCS)

MEETING SUMMARY

HARVEY AND KNOTT DRUM SITE
KIRKWOOD, NEW CASTLE COUNTY, DELAWARE
SEPTEMBER 12, 1985

A public meeting was held at 7:00 p.m. on September 12, 1985, at the Glasgow High School, 1901 South College Avenue, Newark, Delaware. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss remedial investigation and feasibility study (RI/FS) findings with area residents and other interested parties and to solicit their comments. Prior to the meeting, fact sheets were mailed to addressees on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) mailing list. The fact sheets discussed the RI/FS and described the process used to screen remedial action alternatives for the Harvey and Knott Drum Site. Those alternatives selected for continued consideration were briefly described. An additional fact sheet, detailing the remedial action alternative preferred by the EPA and the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC), was distributed at the meeting.

Sharon Fitzgerald of the DNREC opened the meeting and introduced the first speaker, EPA Region III Community Relations Coordinator, E. Ann Cardinal. Ms. Cardinal discussed the steps of the Superfund process that remain to be performed at the Harvey and Knott Drum Site. She explained that the site poses a long-term threat rather than an immediate one and emphasized that remediation would be a lengthy process. The selection of a specific remedial action alternative would be followed, Ms. Cardinal stated, by a design phase, and actual construction activities could not be expected to begin in less than a year. Before turning the meeting over to the EPA Regional Site Project Officer (RSPO), Joseph Dugandzic, Ms. Cardinal provided the address of the EPA Region III office in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for those who wanted to make written responses to the EPA studies and/or recommendations.

Mr. Dugandzic discussed the results of the RI/FS, describing site characteristics and the nature and extent of contamination, and he also detailed the remedial action alternative preferred by the EPA and the DNREC. He supported his talk with a slide presentation and concluded by opening the floor to discussion. Mr. Steven Young of the DNREC elaborated on some of Mr. Dugandzic's points on two occasions, at Mr. Dugandzic's request. Following the presentation there was a brief question and answer session.

The meeting was attended by about 10 people who were very attentive. Three representatives from the local media were present, and they conducted interviews with Ms. Cardinal and Mr. Dugandzic before and after the meeting.

Attached is a responsiveness summary detailing issues raised at the meeting and the EPA's responses to these issues.

AR500016

A SUMMARY OF
CITIZEN AND INTERESTED-PARTY COMMENTS AND CONCERNS
AND OF U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RESPONSES

ORIGINAL
(Red)

HARVEY AND KNOTT DRUM SITE
KIRKWOOD, NEW CASTLE COUNTY, DELAWARE
SEPTEMBER 1985

Monitoring and Artesian Wells

Issue: Are there monitoring wells on the site?

Response: Yes, both deep and shallow monitoring wells are located in clusters around the site. There are at least 17 monitoring wells on site. (A slide was presented to show monitoring well locations.)

Issue: Wells in the Shelly Farms area and in the area north and northwest of the site on State Route 40 have been going dry. Could the artesian wells be responsible?

Response: Because of the existence of the Potomac clay, it is unlikely that the deep wells are affecting the shallow wells. There is a great deal of water in the shallow aquifer, and the annual precipitation in the area is sufficient to replenish the supply. Shallow wells at the site are not going dry. However, the wells that are going dry are located in an area that is not involved in our study. It would be a good idea to find out more about conditions in that area from the appropriate local authorities.

A Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) spokesman stated that this has been a dry year and that wells across the entire state have been going dry.

Issue: How deep are the artesian wells?

Response: They are about 230 feet deep.

Soil Contamination

Issue: Is the soil contaminated?

Response: There are volatile contaminants in the surface and subsurface soils now. The recommended remedial action alternative will flush these contaminants from the soil.

Issue: Will you be removing the contaminants or just dispersing them?

Response: Water treatment will probably consist of an initial air stripping facility to remove volatile organics from the water, and there will most likely be a carbon adsorption unit for polishing.

ORIGINAL
Red)

ORIGINAL
(Red)

Issue: How long will it take to flush the contaminants from the soil?

Response: That will depend on how many aquifer volumes can be flushed through the system. Water flows very quickly in this area. We will keep water flushing through the system toward extraction wells, and we will treat the water and monitor water quality. After a point, the percentage of volatiles in the water will cease to reduce significantly, and at that time, we will have to decide if it is worthwhile to continue flushing water through the system.

Procedural Issues

Issue: Is there any chance the State government will reject the EPA's remedial recommendations?

Response: The EPA has put a lot of time into deciding on the remedial action alternative that is being recommended for this site and the State has already written a memo approving the EPA recommendations. No problems are anticipated.

Issue: Will the EPA take action against Harvey and Knott Trucking, Inc.?

Response: Part of the Superfund law requires that the Federal Government attempt to identify all potentially responsible parties (PRPs) and then find some kind of remedy with the help of the PRPs. PRPs include site owners, waste transporters, chemical manufacturers, and disposers--everyone identified with a site. From that standpoint, since they were owners and were operating as transporters, they would be identified as responsible parties. Enforcement efforts, however, are the responsibility of the attorneys.

Water Quality

Issue: Four years ago, the State sampled residential water supplies. What was found?

Response: The State did not find the water to be contaminated. The latest residential water samples indicate no organics above detection limits and no inorganic contamination exceeding the primary drinking water standards. As the earlier slide presentation illustrated, the groundwater contamination seems to be heading in a southerly or southeasterly direction.